

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application. After entry of the above amendments, Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 will be amended and Claims 53-60 will be added. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

**1. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, 27-29, 31-34, 36, and 37.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,983,099 (Yao). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that Yao does not disclose “transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. In addition, per claims 6 and 32, Applicants respectfully submit that Yao does not disclose “re-establishing traffic channel . . . simultaneously with the transmitting the floor-control request.”

C. In addition, per claims 8 and 34, Applicants respectfully submit that Yao does not disclose “renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP) . . . simultaneously with the transmitting the floor-control request.” There is not even a mention of “renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP)” in Yao.

D. In addition, per claims 10-11 and 36-37, Applicants respectfully submit that Yao does not disclose “receiving a response to the floor-control request on a forward common channel” or “receiving the response includes receiving the response on a forward paging channel.” Col. 7, lines 21-39 of Lao discloses only dedicated forward and reverse traffic channels.

**2. Rejection of Claims 4 and 30.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being obvious over Yao in view of U.S. patent No. 6,308,079 (Pan). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lao nor Pan discloses “transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. Applicants also respectfully submit that neither Yao nor Pan discloses “transmitting the floor-control request on a reverse enhanced access channel (R-EACH).” Applicants agree with the Examiner that Yao fails to disclose the claimed limitation. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that Pan discloses what Lao fails to disclose. In Col. 3, lines 34-50 of Pan, there is no mention of “reverse enhanced access channel.”

**3. Rejection of Claims 9, 12, 13, 35, 38, and 39.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being obvious over Yao in view of PCT Application WO-99/53631 (Gu). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lao nor Gu discloses transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. In addition, per claims 9 and 35, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lao nor Gu discloses transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram in short data burst (SDB) form.

C. In addition, per claims 12-13 and 38-39, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lao nor Gu discloses “receiving the response on a forward common control channel (F-CCCH) of the wireless network” and “receiving the response in short data burst (SDB) form on a forward common channel.”

**4. Rejection of Claims 14-16, 18-21, 23, 24, 40-42, 44-47, 49, and 50.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being obvious over Yao in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,405 (Maher). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lao nor Maher discloses “transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. In addition, per claims 19, 21, 45, and 47, neither Yao nor Maher discloses the claimed limitations as discussed for claims 6 and 8.

C. In addition, per claims 23-24 and 49-50, neither Yao nor Maher discloses the claimed limitations as discussed for claims 10-11.

**5. Rejection of Claims 17 and 43.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being obvious over Yao over Maher in view of Pan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references discloses “transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. In addition, none of the references discloses “transmitting includes transmitting the floor-control request on a reverse access channel (R-ACH) of the wireless network,” as discussed per claims 4 and 30 above.

**6. Rejection of Claims 22, 25, 26, 48, 51-52.**

The Examiner rejected the above claims as being obvious over Yao and Maher in view of PCT Application WO-99/53631 (Gu). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Applicants respectfully submit that neither none of the references discloses “transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram,” as now claimed in independent Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40. Support for this limitation may be found in Paragraphs 49 and 72 of the instant application.

B. In addition, per claims 22 and 48, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references discloses transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram in short data burst (SDB) form.

C. In addition, per claims 25-26 and 51-52, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references discloses “receiving the response on a forward common control channel (F-CCCH) of the wireless network” and “receiving the response in short data burst (SDB) form on a forward common channel.”

**APPENDIX A**

1. In a communication device, a method for reducing latency in a group communication network, the method comprising:

receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a group call; and

transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram on a reverse common channel of a wireless network to a controller.

14. In a communication device, a computer-readable medium embodying a method for reducing latency in a group communication network, the method comprising:

receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a group call; and

transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram on a reverse common channel of a wireless network to a controller.

27. A communication device for reducing latency in a group communication network, comprising:

means for receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a group call; and

means for transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram on a reverse common channel of a wireless network to a controller.

40. A communication device for reducing latency in a group communication network, the communication device comprising:

a receiver;

a transmitter; and

a processor communicatively coupled to the receiver and the transmitter, the processor being capable of:

receiving a floor-control request from a user of the communication device who wishes to initiate a group call; and

transmitting the floor-control request as an Internet protocol (IP) datagram on a reverse common channel of a wireless network to a controller.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 May 2003

By: Abdollah Katbab  
**Abdollah Katbab**  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,325

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 651-4132  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502